

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
WESTERN DIVISION

NELSON GOMES, individually, derivatively )  
and on behalf of all others similarly situated, )  
 )  
Plaintiff, )

vs. )

Case No. 14-0283-CV-W-ODS

)  
AMERICAN CENTURY COMPANIES, INC., )  
AMERICAN CENTURY INVESTMENT )  
MANAGEMENT, INC., JAMES E. STOWERS, )  
JR., JAMES E. STOWERS, III, JONATHAN )  
S. THOMAS, THOMAS A. BROWN, )  
ANDREA C. HALL, DONALD H. PRATT, )  
GALE E. SAYERS, M. JEANNINE )  
STRANDJORD, TIMOTHY S. WEBSTER, )  
WILLIAM M. LYONS, ENRIQUE CHAN, )  
MARK KOPINSKI and BRIAN BRADY, )

Defendants, )

and )

)  
AMERICAN CENTURY WORLD MUTUAL )  
FUNDS, INC., d/b/a AMERICAN CENTURY )  
INTERNATIONAL DISCOVERY FUND, )  
 )  
Nominal Defendant. )

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO STAY AND SETTING DEADLINE  
FOR FILING OF JOINT PROPOSED SCHEDULING ORDER

Over Plaintiff's opposition, Defendants' Motion to Stay (Doc. # 14) is granted. The Court rejects Plaintiff's arguments that the Board has abdicated its authority to evaluate Plaintiff's demand and potentially terminate the litigation.

Contrary to Defendants' suggestion, activity in this case is stayed until January 2, 2015. By that time, the committee formed to investigate Plaintiff's litigation demand shall have completed its work and a final decision whether to act on or refuse the

demand shall have been made. The Court believes this is sufficient time for three reasons:

1. In the related case of Seidl v. American Century Companies, the plaintiff's demand was issued in June 2010. An investigation was completed and a decision was made by February 2011.
2. The Court believes that Defendants would have acted with alacrity and started its investigation at least by May 19, 2014 (the date the Motion to Stay was filed). The Court would be greatly disappointed to learn Defendants filed a Motion to Stay so it could conduct an investigation, then waited until after the motion was ruled before actually commencing the investigation. In any event, Defendants should not expect that the January 2 deadline will be extended.
3. There is a significant overlap in issues between Seidl and the present case. Consequently, there is a significant amount of investigative work and analysis that has already been performed.

The stay will be lifted on January 2, 2015. If Plaintiff's demand is rejected, the parties will meet and by January 23, 2015 the parties will file a Joint Proposed Scheduling Order. The Joint Proposal shall comply with Local Rules 16.1(d), 16.1(f), 26.1(c) and 26.1(d). To the extent the parties cannot agree on a particular matter, the Joint Proposal shall set forth both views. In accordance with Local Rule 16.1(d), plaintiff's counsel shall take the lead in preparing the Proposed Plan.

The Joint Proposal shall be filed on or before January 12, 2015.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATE: July 1, 2014

/s/ Ortrie D. Smith  
ORTRIE D. SMITH, SENIOR JUDGE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT